

Attorney's Docket No.: Intel 10559-277001 /  
P9284

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of this reply, claims 1-31 will remain in the application.

Claim 1-13, 15-19, 21-25, and 27 were rejected as being allegedly anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102 by U.S. Patent No. 5,740,413 to Alpert, et al. ("Alpert" or "the Alpert patent"). Claims 14, 20, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,530,804 to Edgington, et al.

Applicants reaffirm their belief that all claims are in a condition of allowance because all the independent claims are distinguishable from the Alpert patent, as discussed in detail in Applicants' previous response. For example, there is no active selection of a debug mode in Alpert; rather, Alpert discloses a mere passive enabling of particular debug events. Furthermore, there is no causal relationship in Alpert between the operating mode of the processor and a debug mode.

However, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 5, 11, 17, and 22 and have added new claims 28-31, which depend from claim 1, to further clarify that the present subject matter is different from that of Alpert.

For example, Alpert does not disclose or suggest "invoking one of a plurality of debug handlers, wherein the plurality of debug handlers includes a first debug handler and a second debug handler" as recited in amended claim 1 (emphasis added). Rather, Alpert states that "[t]he appropriate handler for debug events is the debug handler. Thus, in response to each debug event, the debug handler is executed." Alpert patent, col. 1,

Attorney's Docket No.: Intel 10559-277001 /  
P9284

11. 56-58. "Several different debug events may be serviced by a single handler." Alpert patent, col. 1, ll. 64-65 (emphasis added). In addition, Figure 1 of Alpert discloses only a single debug handler (Debug Software 122). Accordingly, amended claim 1 is allowable over Alpert. Independent claims 5, 11, 17, and 22 as amended recite substantially similar claim limitations and are thus also allowable over Alpert.

Because the Alpert patent does not disclose or suggest invoking one of a plurality of debug handlers, it also does not disclose or suggest "the first debug handler [being] capable of debugging the second debug handler" as recited in new dependent claim 28. For similar reasons, Alpert does not disclose or suggest the subject matter of new dependent claims 29-31.

Furthermore, new claims 28-31 depend from amended claim 1, which is believed to be allowable, as discussed above. For at least this reason, these claims are believed to themselves be allowable.

Applicants note that the Form PTO-1449 filed with the Information Disclosure Statement on December 22, 2003, has not been initialed and returned. Applicants request that the Examiner consider the reference filed with the Information Disclosure Statement and return the initialed Form PTO-1449 as soon as possible. A copy of the Form PTO-1449 filed 12/22/2003 is attached for the Examiner's convenience.


Attorney's Docket No.: Intel 10559-277001 /  
P9284

CONCLUSION

Applicants ask that all claims be allowed. Please apply the excess claims fee of \$72.00 and any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 24, 2004

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Scott C. Harris  
Reg. No. 32,030

Attorneys for Intel Corporation

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
PTO Customer Number: 20985  
12390 El Camino Real  
San Diego, CA 92130  
Telephone: (858) 678-5070  
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099  
10385996.doc

/s/ EY  
KENYON S. JENCKES  
REG. NO. 41,873